

REMARKS

Claims 2, 10-13, 17-19, 21, 23, 31, 33, 35-42, 45 and 46 are pending in the application. Claims 21 and 36 have been amended. Claim 46 is newly added. Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

Claim 21 has been amended to correct its dependency from canceled claim 1 to claim 45.

The Office Action objects to claim 36 alleging that there is a grammatical error at lines 8-10. It is assumed that the reference to lines 8-10 is a typographical error since claim 36 only has six lines and that lines 3 and 4 were actually intended. Lines 3 and 4 of claim 36 have been amended as suggested by the Examiner. Accordingly, it is submitted that the objection is obviated by the Amendment and should be withdrawn.

The Office Action rejects claims 2, 31, 38, 40 and 45 under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as unpatentable over International Publication No. WO 99/21336 to Slaby et al., hereafter Slaby, in view of U.S Patent No. 6,073,172 to Frailong et al., hereafter Frailong.

Slaby does not teach authentication of the identity of the router by the configuration service. Merely checking that the serial number is valid does not constitute evidence that the entity providing the serial number is the entity to which it is assigned. Thus, Slaby does not teach the step of “using the identity-sequence certificate to authenticate the unit to the configuration service”, as recited in claim 45.

Moreover, Slaby does not teach the downloading of a user-id certificate that the router subsequently uses to authenticate itself to the service provider. Thus, Slaby does not teach the step of “transferring from the service to the unit ...a user-id certificate associating the public key of the unit with a user Identity” or “the user id-certificate being used to authenticate the unit to the [service] entity”, as recited in claim 45.

Frailong does not teach either of the above noted deficiencies of Slaby. Frailong teaches a Certificate Authority that issues certificates. Each of the certificates includes the name of the issuer of the particular Certificate Authority that signed it and a distinguished subject name (column 19, lines 35-38). Each certificate also includes a serial number of the certificate column 20, lines 13 and 14). Thus, Frailong's certificates merely teach linking a certificate to a public key and to a particular Certificate Authority that signed the certificate and not to a user identity as contended by the Examiner. Frailong's certificates appear to merely establish the security of a particular connection between two parties and not an authentication of either party's device or identity.

There is nothing in Slaby or Frailong that suggests that a different certificate be used to authenticate Slaby's router to the configuration service and service provider. As the authentication process to be carried out would be the same in each case, there is no motivation to use different certificates in the suggested Slaby/Frailong combination.

Thus, the Slaby/Frailong combination suggested by the Examiner does not provide the above noted deficiencies of Slaby. Accordingly, it is submitted that the rejection of claim 45 is erroneous and should be withdrawn.

Independent system claim 31 recites authentication means for carrying out the authentication on the basis of the identity-sequence certificate and means for deriving and transmitting the user-id certificate. The association between the two recited certificates is not taught by either Slaby or Frailong as noted above and, therefore cannot be a part of the suggested Slaby/Frailong combination.

Independent connectivity unit claim 38 recites authentication means for use in authenticating the unit to a configuration service on the basis of the identity-sequence certificate, and for use in authenticating the unit to a service entity on the basis of the user-id certificate. The association between the two recited certificates is not taught by

either Slaby or Frailong as noted above and, therefore cannot be a part of the suggested Slaby/Frailong combination.

For the reasons set forth above, it is submitted that the rejection of claims 2, 31, 38, 40 and 45 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) is erroneous and should be withdrawn.

The Office Action rejects claims 10, 33 and 39 under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as unpatentable over Slaby, in view of Frailong and further in view of U.S Patent No. 6,105,131 to Carroll, hereafter Carroll.

This rejection is erroneous for the reasons set forth above in the discussion of independent claims 31, 38 and 45, from which claims 10, 33 and 39 depend.

For the reasons set forth above, it is submitted that the rejection of claims 10, 33 and 39 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) is erroneous and should be withdrawn.

The Office Action rejects claims 11-13, 17-19, 35, 41 and 42 under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as unpatentable over Slaby, in view of Frailong and further in view of the article, “Remote Authentication Dial In User Services”, to Rigney et al., hereafter Rigney.

This rejection is erroneous for the reasons set forth above in the discussion of independent claims 31, 38 and 45, from which claims 11-13, 17-19, 35, 41 and 42 depend.

For the reasons set forth above, it is submitted that the rejection of claims 11-13, 17-19, 35, 41 and 42 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) is erroneous and should be withdrawn.

The Office Action rejects claims 21, 23, 36 and 37 under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as unpatentable over Slaby, in view of Frailong and further in view of U.S Patent No. 6,526,131 to Zimmerman et al., hereafter Zimmerman.

This rejection is erroneous for the reasons set forth above in the discussion of independent claims 31 and 45, from which claims 21, 23, 36 and 37 depend.

For the reasons set forth above, it is submitted that the rejection of claims 21, 23, 36 and 37 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) is erroneous and should be withdrawn.

The Office Action cites a number of patents that were not applied in the rejections of the claims. These patents have been reviewed, but are believed to be inapplicable to the claims.

Newly presented claim 46 recites a method of configuring a connectivity unit for communication with a service entity that recites steps involving the two certificates and their association. Thus, claim 46 distinguishes from the cited art for the same reasons set forth above for independent claims 31, 38 and 45. Accordingly, it is submitted that claim 46 is distinguished from the cited art and is, therefore, allowable.

It is respectfully requested for the reasons set forth above that the objection to claim 36 be withdrawn, that the rejection 35 U.S.C. 103(a) be withdrawn, that claims 2, 10-13, 17-19, 21, 23, 31, 33, 35-42, 45 and 46 be allowed and that this application be passed to issue.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: 8-24-04



Paul D. Greeley

Reg. No. 31,019
Attorney for Applicants
Ohlandt, Greeley, Ruggiero & Perle, L.L.P.
One Landmark Square, 10th Floor
Stamford, CT 06901-2682
(203) 327-4500